



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/821,183	03/29/2001	Srinivas Gutta	US010105	4515
24737 7590 07/29/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER SHEPARD, JUSTIN E				
ART UNIT 2623		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 07/29/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/821,183

Applicant(s)

GUTTA ET AL.

Examiner

Justin E. Shepard

Art Unit

2623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, 21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-19, 21 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/13/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/13/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Page 11, last paragraph:

The applicant argues that the action taken for a given attribute is the same for each user and is not in accordance with action preferences of a user. Referring to Imagawa (column 3, lines 53-57; column 10, lines 40-45), the identity of a user can be identified by the system and by using the identification the actions of the device can be changed (by identifying the person watching television is a child and then not allowing the child to use the television after a certain time of day). The examiner interprets this as performing a certain action depending on an action preference of a user, as if an adult specifies that their child isn't allowed to watch TV after a certain time, the device

Art Unit: 2623

will identify the child and stop that action from being performed because of the preference set by the parent.

Applicant's remaining arguments with respect to the amended claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa in view of Herrington.

Referring to claim 1, Imagawa discloses a method for controlling a media player, comprising:

establishing at least one rule defining a predefined user activity (column 3, lines 53-57; column 10, lines 40-45), said rule including at least one condition (column 10, lines 40-45), and an action item to be performed to automatically adjust said media player in accordance with action preferences of said user when said condition is satisfied (column 10, lines 40-45);

analyzing at least one of audio and video information focused on said user to identify said condition (column 2, lines 31-42); and

performing said action item if said condition is satisfied (column 10, lines 40-45).

Imagawa does not disclose a method for controlling a media player that includes information external to user, wherein the additional information external to said user includes a information selected from the group consisting of information from an electronic program guide and information from a caller identification device.

Herrington discloses a method for controlling a media player that includes information external to user, wherein the additional information external to said user includes a information selected from the group consisting of information from an electronic program guide and information from a caller identification device (column 7, lines 51-54; column 8, lines 60-62; figure 4B).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the rating restriction from Herrington to the system disclosed by Imagawa. The motivation would have been that the system allows individuals to be identified (Imagawa: column 10, lines 40-45) and programming restrictions for specific users.

Claims 11 and 21 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 1.

Referring to claim 6, Imagawa discloses a method for controlling a device, comprising:

analyzing at least one of audio and video information focused on a user to identify at least one predefined user activity (column 2, lines 31-42; column 3, lines 53-57);

performing a predefined action item to automatically adjust said device in accordance with action preferences of said user based on said additional information when said user activity is identified, wherein the predefined user activity is not related to controlling the device (column 10, lines 40-45).

Imagawa does not disclose a method for controlling a media player that includes information external to user, wherein the additional information external to said user includes a information selected from the group consisting of information from an electronic program guide and information from a caller identification device.

Herrington discloses a method for controlling a media player that includes information external to user, wherein the additional information external to said user includes a information selected from the group consisting of information from an electronic program guide and information from a caller identification device (column 7, lines 51-54; column 8, lines 60-62; figure 4B).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the rating restriction from Herrington to the system disclosed by Imagawa. The motivation would have been that the system allows individuals to be identified (Imagawa: column 10, lines 40-45) and programming restrictions for specific users.

Claims 16 and 22 are rejected on the same grounds as claim 6.

As for Claim 5 Imagawa et al. teach said user activity is a predefined gesture command and said action item is the issuance of a corresponding command .to said media player (see col. 11 lines 52-58 "When a pers6n makes a motion of applying

forefinger to the front of the mouth or plugging the ears with the hands, the control object candidate determination section 3 determines as a candidate the television that outputs sound, and the control content candidate determination section 4 determines the reduction of the sound volume as a candidate for the content of control.").

Claim 15 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 5.

Claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa in view of Herrington as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, 16, 21, and 22 above, and further in view of DeVito.

As for Claims 2, 7, 12, 17, and 18 the claims differ in that Imagawa and Herrington do not expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command to pause said media player. However, in the same field of endeavor, DeVito teaches a method and apparatus for measuring and analyzing the psychological states of a subject and using the gather information to control devices, such as media players. See DeVito (0003) "the present invention relates to the measurement and real-time analysis of bioelectrical signals for interaction with electronic media, such as motion pictures, digital video, video games," and (0010) "A presence detecting function which senses the relationship of a subject to a predetermined space may be used to select an object or appliance to be controlled within a space. The control signals may be used to affect objects e.g., a compact disk player," and also (0112) "Additionally, a delay may be specified which causes the movie to pause for the specified duration before proceeding

to the next scene or set. Such a delay may be used, for example, to wait for a change in the subject's emotional state, which change then directs the branching of the movie to the next scene." And also see (0116) "The script may also specify that playback should halt until a specified criteria is satisfied. One example is a rapid eye movement ("REM") trigger, which is particularly useful for use with interactive dream movies or for triggering dream stimulus Another example may be to wait for the beta band power and the median beta frequency to exceed thresholds indicating the viewer is paying attention." Clearly, DeVito teaches analyzing the emotional state of a subject that comprises pausing or halting playback of a media player when the emotional state of the user indicates that the user is not paying attention to the media player. In light of the teaching of DeVito, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Imagawa and Herrington to have the media player be paused in response to an indication that the user is not paying attention to the media player. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to do this in order to not have a user missing a programming that is displayed on a media player, when it is determined that the user is not paying attention to the media player.

Claims 3, 8, 13, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa in view of Herrington in view of DeVito as applied to claims 2, 7, 12, and 17 above, and further in view of Pijnenburg.

As for Claim 3, 8, 13, and 18, the claims differ in that neither Imagawa, Herrington, nor DeVito expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command to said media player to begin recording.

Pijnenburg discloses a television viewing system where recording starts when the player is paused (column 3, lines 57-59).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the ability to record when the system pauses, as taught by Pijnenburg, to the system that pauses when a level of interest is not detected as disclosed by Imagawa, Herrington and DeVito. The motivation would have been to allow the viewer to leave unexpectedly, and not miss anything shown in the television program (Pijnenburg: column 3, line 58).

Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imagawa in view of Herrington as applied to claims 1, 5, 6, 11, 15, 16, 21, and 22 above, and further in view of Kimoto.

As for Claims 4, 9, 14, and 19 the claims differ in that Imagawa and Herrington do not expressly teach said user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention to said media player and said action item is the issuance of a command to said media player to enter a power save mode. However, Kimoto et al. teaches a method and apparatus for power saving modes for a media player (such a computer monitor) when the media player has been on, but not in use for a specified amount of time (see Kimoto

et al. col. 1 lines 8-12 "In order to reduce power consumption, computer monitors have been designed having a power- save mode that is automatically selected after the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time." When the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time, this condition is interpreted as the user has not been paying attention to said media player for specified amount of time.) in light of the teaching of Kimoto et al., it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teaching of Imagawa and Herrington to issue a command to said media player to enter a power save mode when the user activity suggests that said user is not paying attention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this in order to conserve energy consumed by the media player when the user is not paying attention to the media player. (see Kimoto et al. col. 1 lines 8-12 "In order to reduce power consumption, computer monitors have been designed having a power-save mode that is automatically selected after the monitor has been on, but not in use, for a long period of time.").

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2623

JS